Certainly we should be giving serious thought to the small children who are increasingly left at home by working mothers—these 2 million or more mothers of children under six. During the war we had a Federal program to coordinate and assist States and localities in providing for suitable day care centers for such children. Since 1946, we have not.

There is surely much more than could be done for the millions of children who suffer simply from want. Our school lunch and school milk programs need constant strengthening and expanding in order to cope with the expanding school populations; yet it is invariably a sharp struggle before we are periodically able to do this. The children of migratory workers, handicapped children from low-income homes, emotionally disturbed children—all these constitute a heavy burden for local communities. They need the interest and assistance of the American people expressed through the Federal Government.

What nobler achievement can you and I expect to accomplish than to send the children of this generation onward into life with perhaps a little better start than we had. What finer objective can a society have than to see that the innocence of its children is not broken on the wheel of poverty, suffering and degradation?

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now considering Senate Resolution 94, which I introduced on March 24th last. The purpose of this resolution is to delete the self-judging reservation contained in our declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

I am gratified that my resolution has the solid support of the President, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General important groups like the American Bar Association and influential newspapers like the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent editorials in support of Senate Resolution 94, "Why Not Use the Court?" from the New York Times, January 29, 1960, and "Back to the World Court," from the Washington Post and Times Herald, February 1, 1960, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1960]

WHY NOT USE THE COURT?

For nearly a decade and a half there has been an International Court of Justice, under United Nations auspices. For many years before World War II began a somewhat similar body, authorized by the League of Nations, and called the Permanent Court of International Justice, also sat in the red brick Peace Palace at The Hague. The trouble with the present Court, as with the former, is that no nation has to take a case before it and that the decisions it does render are not enforceable.

The United States complained to the Court in 1952 about a Russian attack on one of our airplanes off the coast of Japan and Russian treatment of a U.S. aircrew forced down in Hungary in 1954. In each case the Russians contended we were at fault and that no Court inquiry was necessary. The Court then held it had no jurisdiction. A case that kept the Court pleasantly occupied last year had to do with 66 acres of land in dispute between the Netherlands and Belgium under agreements of 1839 and 1949.

This country, in line with action taken by some other countries, ratified the statute of the Court in 1946 with a reservation that we would decide for ourselves whether or not a case was "within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." Within the last year or two the Eisenhower administration has been concerned with getting this, the so-called Connally amendment, repealed. The President urged repeal a year ago and again this year in his state of the Union message. This week Secretary of State Herter and Attorney General Rogers have appeared before a Senate committee to support Senator Humphrey's repeal resolution. Whatever may be the fortune [illegible] of some of our still surviving isolationists, there really is no great danger that we will have to go to The Hague to explain the segregation situation in Little Rock, defend a tariff on wool, or argue the restrictions on immigration.

If we believe in government by law at home, there is no reason why we should not sustain the rule of law throughout the world. We will have plenty of sovereignty left after the 15 elderly gentlemen at The Hague have done all that they possibly could to deal with any complaint that might be brought into court against our country.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1960]

BACK TO THE WORLD COURT

The issue laid before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Secretary Herter and Attorney General Rogers is whether the United States believes in the International Court of Justice. The Senate pretended to settle this question back in 1946 when it voted adherence to the statute creating the Court. It was only a pretense, however, for at the same time the Senate adopted a reservation which claimed for the United States the right to determine whether any dispute taken to the World Court is within this country's domestic jurisdiction.

The statute creating the World Court provides that "in the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by a decision of the Court." Clearly the Senate rejected the principle which is basic to any system of international justice. It said the United States must be its own judge as to whether cases in which it is involved shall go to the Court. With every country exercising this foolish privilege, the Court is completely hamstrung. Judge Guerrero of the World Court has stated the truth very bluntly in an opinion: "• • • it is not possible to establish a system of law if each state reserves to itself the power to decide itself what the law is."

We are glad that Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee prodded the State Department into sending topflight witnesses to testify for repeal of the reservation. The move is wholly nonpartisan, being sponsored by Democratic Senator HUMPHREY and having full support of the administration. In our opinion, it is one of the most important measures before the present Congress. For if any progress is to be made toward the development of a system of international justice, the leadership must come from the United States. The comment of Wallace McClure on the present situation in his book, "World Legal Order," is pertinent:

"There can be no doubt • • • that attempts of 'great' nations to cut their cake and have it, too, are quite as malignant as such attempts on the part of small boys: both need to grow up."

NUCLEAR TEST SUSPENSION NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have one final item. I will take only a few moments of the time of the Senate.

I was very much disturbed today when I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article written by Mr. Marquis Childs, noted Washington columnist, entitled "Test Talks Near Brink of Failure."

I ask unanimous consent that the article in its entire text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST TALKS NEAR BRINK OF FAILURE

(By Marquis Childs)

Largely as a result of a deep-seated conflict within the Eisenhower administration, the nuclear test ban talks at Geneva have deteriorated to the point at which there may be no alternative but to break them off.

The State Department has been seriously embarrassed by what high officials believe was a calculated leak from within the Government here. As a consequence, the effort to get agreement with the Russians and the British on a compromise proposal for a test ban has probably been blocked.

This comes at the start of the effort to work out a common Western position on disarmament for negotiations with the Communist bloc to begin on March 15. Failure of the Geneva talks, whether acknowledged or merely in the form of a more or less open stalemate, would throw serious doubt on the East-West disarmament talks at the outset. The impasse reached in the test ban talks is part of a general deterioration in Soviet-American relations from the optimism of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev Camp David meeting last September.

The British are indignant at what they interpret as a thinly disguised attempt to force them to go along with the proposal without their prior consent. The Macmillan government is determined to reach an agreement with the Soviets which, while it might not guarantee the detection of small secret atomic blasts, would be a base from which progress could be made toward an all-embracing system of inspection and control. The suspicion has grown in London that powerful forces in Washington, both in the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission, were determined to prevent any agreement from being reached.

The events leading up to the present situation were as follows: The State Department, working with Pentagon and Atomic Energy Commission officials, evolved a compromise proposal to be put before the conference at Geneva.

In essence the United States proposed to ban tests in the upper atmosphere and the larger underground tests. As part of the agreement, scientists of all three powers would work toward a system of detecting the smaller underground blasts with a view eventually to including such blasts within the ban. This is a gross oversimplification of a highly complicated matter involving the opposed findings of Soviet and American scientists on the question of identifying earthquake blasts as against what might be small atomic explosions intended to violate an agreement.

It was agreed within the Government here that a compromise excluding the small underground tests was essential if a nuclear test ban treaty were to be approved by the Senate. Otherwise, American scientists—including those who believe a test ban is in